

Application No. 09/840,531
Amendment "A" dated June 30, 2004
Reply to Office Action mailed April 5, 2004

REMARKS

Applicants express appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesy of the recent interview granted to Applicants' attorney. The claim amendments made by this paper are consistent with the proposed claim amendments and with other suggestions made by the Examiner during the course of the Interview held June 15, 2004.

The first Office Action mailed April 5, 2004, considered claims 1-23. Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ng (U.S. Patent No. 5,262,854). Claims 18-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ng in view of Boyce (U.S. Patent No. 5,828,421). Claims 5 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ng as applied to claims 1 and 9, respectively, and furthering view of Boyce¹. Claims 14-17 were found to include allowable subject matter which has subsequently been amended into each of the independent claims by this paper.

As reflected above, claims 1, 3, 6, 9, 14 and 18 have been amended and new claims 24-27 have been added². Accordingly, claims 1-27 now remain pending for reconsideration, of which claims 1, 9, 18 and 24 are the independent claims at issue.

The amended claims are generally directed to methods (claims 1 and 9) and corresponding computer program products (claims 18 and 24) for subsampling MPEG data to reduce the volume of video data that has to be processed to display the video images. As recited, the claims include processing motion vectors and processing a reference frame to generate predicted subsampled frame data, and processing frequency coefficients of the MPEG data to generate spatial samples that are subsequently subsampled and summed with the predicted subsampled frame data to generate the desired video images. As further claimed, the subsampling of the spatial samples can include weighting of the color parameters of the spatial samples.

The foregoing method, which is recited in each of the pending claims is neither anticipated by nor obviated by the art of record for at least the reasons discussed during the

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

² The claim amendments to the independent claims include elements that the Examiner found to be distinguished and allowable over the art of record in the last action. Amendments to the dependent claims have been made to provide a consistent use of terminology.


Application No. 09/840,531
Amendment "A" dated June 30, 2004
Reply to Office Action mailed April 5, 2004

interview. For example, neither of the references discloses a method for decoding MPEG data that involves weighting color parameters of the spatial samples in combination with other decoding acts. Accordingly, for at least this reason, as well as the others discussed during the interview, the pending claims are distinguished from the art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 30 day of June 2004.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorneys for Applicant

Customer No. 022913

RDN:JCJ:cm
W:\14531\89\CM0000003768V001.DOC